	L4CASALCps	103/13/21 Tage 10/20 1	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKx		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,		
4	v.	(S5) 15-cr-379 (PKC)	
5	OTTO RENE SALGUERO MORALES and RONALD ENRIQUE SALGUERO PORTILLO, et al.,		
7	Defendants.	Conference	
8	x		
9		New York, N.Y. (remote)	
10		April 12, 2021	
11		10:55 a.m.	
12	Before: HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL		
13			
14		District Judge	
15		-	
16	APPEARANCES		
17	AUDREY STRAUSS United States Attorney for the		
18	Southern District of New York BY: DANIEL NESSIM KYLE A. WIRSHBA Assistant United States Attorneys		
19			
20	LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT FEITEL, P.L.L.C.		
21	Attorneys for Defendant Salguero Morales BY: ROBERT FEITEL LINDA GEORGE		
22			
23	Attorney for Defendant Salguero P	OTUIIIO	
2425	Also Present: Cristina Weisz		

(Remote)

THE COURT: This is United States v. Ronald Enrique Salguero Portillo and Otto Salguero Morales. Appearing for the government?

MR. WIRSHBA: Good morning, your Honor. Kyle Wirshba for the government. And I want to apologize. I understand that I missed an email moving this conference up one day, and I am tardy, and I apologize for that to the Court, and to defense counsel, and to defendants. My apologies.

THE COURT: Well, I appreciate the apology. It's a little bit distressing, particularly in a case that is so well staffed by the government. So I'm just -- OK. I thank you for that.

So let me hear from counsel for Ronald Enrique Salguero Portillo.

MS. GEORGE: Good morning, your Honor. Linda George on behalf of Ronald Enrique Salquero Portillo.

THE CLERK: All right. Good morning, Ms. George.

And appearing for Otto Salguero Morales?

MR. FEITEL: Good morning, your Honor. Robert Feitel for defendant Otto Salguero.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Feitel.

Now, let me begin with Ms. George. Your client, is your client on the line, or is your client waiving his appearance in this conference?

1	MS. GEORGE: He is on the line, assisted by the		
2	interpreter.		
3	THE COURT: All right. Ronald Enrique Salguero, can		
4	you hear me?		
5	DEFENDANT SALGUERO PORTILLO: Yes. Yes.		
6	THE COURT: All right. Now, I've been advised that		
7	you wish to waive your physical appearance at this conference		
8	and proceed this morning by telephone. Is that correct, sir?		
9	DEFENDANT SALGUERO PORTILLO: Yes, yes.		
10	THE COURT: All right. If at any point in today's		
11	proceeding you want to speak in private with your lawyer,		
12	Ms. George, I'll give you the opportunity to do so. Do you		
13	understand that?		
14	DEFENDANT SALGUERO PORTILLO: Yes, yes.		
15	THE COURT: Thank you.		
16	Mr. Otto Salguero, I've been advised that you wish to		
17	waive your right to be physically present for this proceeding		
18	and to proceed instead by telephone. Is that correct, sir?		
19	DEFENDANT SALGUERO MORALES: Yes, your Honor.		
20	THE COURT: All right. If at any point today you wish		
21	to speak in private with your attorney, Mr. Feitel, I'll give		
22	you an opportunity to do that. Do you understand that?		

THE COURT: All right. And I find that this

conference cannot be further delayed without substantial harm

DEFENDANT SALGUERO MORALES: Yes.

23

24

25

to the interests of justice, because it is important that this case proceed, a motion schedule be set if one is necessary and, if not, further proceedings in this case can be set.

So let me hear from Ms. George. Well, first of all, let me have the government confirm that discovery is complete in this case.

MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor. Rule 16 is complete in this case.

THE COURT: All right. And you've already acknowledged your *Brady* obligations; is that correct?

MR. WIRSHBA: That's correct, your Honor. And I believe there is an order on the docket.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, Ms. George, are there any motions that your client wishes to make in this case?

MS. GEORGE: Well, first of all, your Honor, I sent two letters to the government requesting additional discovery, which have not been responded to, so therefore, third time around, I just filed a motion requesting additional discovery; I can't really determine what motions will be necessary until I get a little bit more discovery. Basically, I would like to know what my client did and what he didn't. The only thing that I've been given that pertains to my client, quite frankly, is testimony from a cooperator, Ardon Soriano, who makes some statements at a trial. So what I've asked for is what else is

1 there.

L4CASALCps

there. And I've also asked, since the government did provide me with the admitted exhibits that were used at that trial,

U.S. v. Hernandez Alvarado, I would like to have whatever else was provided in discovery there. Perhaps that would enlighten me further. I'm not sure why I only have the admitted exhibits. But there's also a list of other things that I requested.

So I would ask, if the Court would give us another 60 days, maybe for the government to respond to my additional discovery requests and at that time be in a better position to advise the Court as to what motions that I believe are necessary to file. And I say that also because I need time to meet with the defendant once I get some of this other information. And it's been difficult to get these in-person visits at MCC. You have to go and get an appointment now, and as an example, I requested one last thing, I still don't have confirmation on it, because I'd like to see him next week a couple of days.

So these are some of the things that I've been dealing with in terms of time. So I would ask the Court to consider maybe another 60 days and perhaps the government can respond one way or another. I mean, if they agree to give it to me, fine; if they don't want to give it to me, tell me why not. And then I know where to go from there.

THE COURT: Let's hear from the government in terms

of, this is -- I'm looking at your motion, and it looks like it's a motion for a bill of particulars. You also move to compel production of certain documents. I assume, Ms. George, you're thoroughly familiar with the law in this circuit on bills of particulars.

MS. GEORGE: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. GEORGE: But, but --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. GEORGE: If I may, your Honor, the point of requesting also a bill of particulars from the government is hopefully to engage in some kind of conversation which will let me know what additional items, what is out there. I can't speak to them on the phone. The only thing I can do is send a letter, and when I don't receive a response to my letter, then I file a motion. I don't know what else to do. I just want the record to be clear.

THE COURT: OK. So just help me out here. You're not getting your phone calls returned, or what do you mean, you can't speak to them on the phone?

MS. GEORGE: I sent an email to contact me about discovery and I sent a letter to provide me additional, and no one calls me back. I mean, there's five things.

THE COURT: I understand. So I want to hear from the government. Is this true? And why haven't you gotten back to

```
L4CASALCps
```

Ms. George?

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, we have not responded in writing to Ms. George's letters, but I want to be clear that we have had several phone conversations with Ms. George. I do want to point out that --

THE COURT: What was the most recent conversation?

Let's get to the bottom of this right now. What was the most recent conversation?

MR. WIRSHBA: I believe it was in December, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. George, did you send emails requesting a conversation with the government after December?

MS. GEORGE: My letter was sent on January 25, 2021. I sent the letter December 10, 2020, and a letter January 25, 2021.

THE COURT: Did you ask for discovery, or did you ask to talk to them on the phone?

MS. GEORGE: Both. My letters -- I requested discovery and I'm available to discuss. I don't -- you know, not, not that difficult.

THE COURT: Well, no, but I got a different flavor from you a moment ago. The flavor I got was that you had emailed them and said, please contact me to discuss discovery.

MS. GEORGE: My emails were prior to the conversations

we had. Then I took a lot of time to go through the discovery that was provided to me because I am also -- I also represented another defendant, and I have other discovery on a somewhat related matter, I suppose. But in any event, so I -- there's a lot to go through here. And I'm trying to focus in on exactly what are -- what is my client's, Mr. Salguero's, involvement in the conspiracy charged. And so, I don't know, it can't be just the testimony of Mr. Ardon. There seems to be a lot of other stuff here that I'm not getting a copy of. I don't know.

THE COURT: All right. Now, you mentioned representing a client in a related matter?

MS. GEORGE: Yes. I represent Avila Meza, Juan Manuel Avila Meza in a matter before Judge Schofield. And that also involves a police officer out of Honduras. So I'm familiar with some of it.

THE COURT: Hang on a second. Hang on a second. Just last week, I had a *Curcio* hearing relating to Howard Leader, who represented Mr. Pineda in my case and represented another member of the Honduran National Police in a case before Judge Schofield, and that was deemed to require a *Curcio* hearing. Why is a *Curcio* hearing not necessary here?

MS. GEORGE: I guess the government should express their opinion -- I don't think it's required, but maybe the government has a different opinion or maybe the government can say why it's not required.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, let me -- the conflict, if there's a potential conflict, would be one best known to you, and Ronald Enrique Salguero is a former member of the Honduran National Police?

MS. GEORGE: No.

THE COURT: No?

MS. GEORGE: No. Ronald Enrique Salguero is a Guatemalan national.

THE COURT: I see.

MS. GEORGE: My other client was a member of the Honduran National Police. I don't believe it has any connection with anything. But only the government can say that. That's for sure.

THE COURT: OK. Well, they may be of help on this.

So let me -- but I see your point that we may be talking about matters that are just simply not related, other than as to subject matter.

Does the government have a view as to whether there is a potential conflict with Ms. George's representation of the individual in the case before Judge Schofield?

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, I do not have a view at this present time, but I would ask, with the Court's permission, that the government be given an opportunity to just discuss that case with the prosecutors who are handling it to ensure that there is no potential conflict in our view. I personally

was not aware of that potential -- of that issue, and so I would like the opportunity to speak with some of my colleagues about it, with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: All right. And I think Ms. George is entitled and I am entitled for you to have you write a letter within 14 days stating your position.

MR. WIRSHBA: Absolutely, your Honor. And, your Honor, whenever your Honor plans to get back to it, there was one more thing that Ms. George mentioned that I want to make sure that we clarify for the Court, and frankly for Ms. George, if that would be all right.

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead. Go ahead.

MR. WIRSHBA: OK. Thank you, your Honor.

So, your Honor, Ms. George mentioned that she had not received any responses to her discovery letters, including that she hadn't received the discovery from the Hernandez trial, but in fact on January 14th of this year, the government returned a one terabyte hard drive to Ms. George that had on it, amongst other materials, the discovery in that case, just as Ms. George requested, as well as the phone extraction that we had discussed with Ms. George, and certain limited other 3500 material that we had discussed with Ms. George. That was sent to her email on January 14th by a paralegal in my office, Morgan Hearst, copying me. And so, your Honor, the government —

```
1
              THE COURT: Just pause. Just wait a minute.
 2
              MR. WIRSHBA: Yes.
 3
               THE COURT: So this was requested by Ms. George, and
 4
      it was sent via -- how much material was this?
 5
              MR. WIRSHBA: It was a lot of material --
6
              THE COURT: Well, how do you get it --
 7
              MR. WIRSHBA: I apologize.
8
              THE COURT: -- on an email? I can understand how you
9
      get it on a thumb drive, but how do you get it on an email?
10
              MR. WIRSHBA: We didn't get it on an email, your
11
             We asked Ms.George to send us a hard drive. We mailed
12
      that hard drive back to her with the data on it, and we sent
13
      her a confirmatory e-mail, saying, Ms. George, here's the
14
      discovery letter we're sending you that accompanies the
15
     material that we've just mailed to you.
16
               THE COURT: All right. Now, Ms. George, what's the
17
      answer to that? I'm being told that you asked for the
18
      discovery from the Hernandez Alvarado trial. The government
19
      asked you for a hard drive. You supplied it. And they gave
20
      you the material on that hard drive and sent a confirmatory
21
      email. Is that correct?
22
              MS. GEORGE: They gave me discovery on a hard drive.
23
      It's not complete. And that's why I filed the motion as to
24
     what I really wanted.
```

THE COURT: Well, listen, I don't know. I tried to

25

listen carefully. And the --

MS. GEORGE: It's just -- your Honor --

THE COURT: Excuse me. Don't interrupt me. Maybe you chose your words very carefully. But I thought I heard from you this morning that you have not been given anything from the Hernandez Alvarado trial except the testimony of one witness.

MS. GEORGE: No. I also advised your Honor that I received the exhibits that were marked into evidence.

THE COURT: And the exhibits, correct. And nothing else.

MS. GEORGE: That's correct. And what I didn't -- what I didn't get was the list of what I supplied to them in my January 25th letter, because that was in response to receiving what they sent to me.

THE COURT: No, no, no. I'm not talking about that.

I'm talking about what you told me you got and didn't get. And what you told me you got, you got the exhibits. You got the testimony of one witness. And that's it. And now, I'm hearing — and we're going to get to the bottom of this. And if we need to have a prosecutor on the witness stand and a defense counsel on the witness stand, we'll get to the bottom of who's telling the truth. The prosecutor is selling me that the hard drive gave you the discovery from the Hernandez Alvarado trial. Is that not true? Or do you have any reason to doubt the truthfulness of that representation?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GEORGE: Your Honor, I received -- well, I hear -there is discovery that I did not receive that they -- let me -- I'll just give an example. There was expert testimony at the trial. I never --THE COURT: I'm trying to find out whether the government's statement on the record this morning was truthful or not. MS. GEORGE: Well, I think it's partially truthful, but I think it's not complete. Just as --THE COURT: What is the part that's not complete? What do you know of that was discovery in Hernandez Alvarado that they didn't produce to you? MS. GEORGE: Well, I assume -- and Hernandez Alvarado, as I stated, that when they did video recordings, there were -there were -- there was discovery pertaining to those specific video recordings. There was discovery pertaining to experts, the experts that they called. There was discovery pertaining to, they had a professor who testified. I didn't get any of that. With respect to one of the witnesses -- and I understand about the DEA-6 and the R-302s. But I did not see, you know, copies of documents pertaining to particular witnesses. So --

THE COURT: Are you talking about Rule 16 discovery

MS. GEORGE: I think -- both. And --

THE COURT: OK. So tell me what Rule 16 discovery you think the government didn't give you from that case.

MS. GEORGE: Well, I don't think I have anything with respect to the video recordings. I don't have documents pertaining to the expert testimony, such as CVs or things of that nature. I, you know, and I'm just going through my list here. I don't have everything in front of me. But it's what I state basically in my motion. And I don't have a problem to sit down with them and go through everything again, but there are some things that are miss — that are just not here.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. George, I'm having trouble with the sweeping description of the government's failures contrasted with the sweeping representations made by the government. And it gives me fear and concern that one side or the other is overstating the position. And that's what I'm trying to get to the bottom of it, because it --

MS. GEORGE: OK.

THE COURT: -- it relates to credibility.

MS. GEORGE: I appreciate --

THE COURT: Yes. Let me find out from Mr. Wirshba, what is the situation with regard to the materials that were referenced by Ms. George?

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, as you might imagine, the materials that we produced, which is the Rule 16 discovery in

the Hernandez trial, are rather voluminous. With respect to the particular items that Ms. George is referencing, I would need a little more time in order to be able to respond to those particular things. And of course the government is happy to engage with Ms. George about that. But, you know, we produced to Ms. George the Rule 16 material, as I understand it, in that Tony Hernandez trial. And so to the extent that there is additional material that Ms. George knows of or believes exists, we would be happy to go back and see if those are in the discovery that we've already produced, or whether they might not be for some reason. But it's my understanding that the government produced everything that was Rule 16 in that trial.

THE COURT: All right. I have a representation from the government, and I have a claim from Ms. George that the representation is not true. So what we're going to do is — are you doing anything this afternoon, Ms. George?

MS. GEORGE: I am available by phone to -- as your Honor knows, I'm not in the district. I'm not in Southern District. I'm out of the district. So I'm not here. I'll be back in the district on Thursday the 15th.

THE COURT: You're available by phone this afternoon?

MS. GEORGE: Sure. I'm available any time, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Wirshba, are you available this

1 afternoon?

MR. WIRSHBA: Of course, your Honor. I have another conference at, I believe, 2:30 this afternoon, but otherwise can of course be available.

THE COURT: All right. Would 3:30 be convenient for you all?

MS. GEORGE: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WIRSHBA: Of course, your Honor.

whether you can sort this out, whether I have been lied to by one or the other side here. One side says they have produced all Rule 16 discovery, bar none, from the Hernandez Alvarez trial — recognizing that when that kind of a representation is made, there could be something that got overlooked or clipped or what have you. But substantially all. And I have the other side saying that's simply not true. So I would like to know who is exaggerating here, to begin with. And if there are issues you want to discuss and press, have your meeting, have your discussion, and within two weeks from today I want to get a letter setting forth any outstanding discovery issue, mindful of the law of this circuit on bills of particulars and the scope of Rule 16 discovery, and also the provisions of the Jencks Act.

So will that work for you, Ms. George?

MS. GEORGE: Of course it will, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Feitel, let me hear from you. Do you have any motions in this case?

MR. FEITEL: Good morning, your Honor. I do not have any motions pending with the Court. And I can report to your Honor that I also received a copy of the hard drive. I provided one to the government that was received by my office on or about January 15th. I thereafter sent a discovery letter to the government. We engaged in some emails. And we actually had a phone discussion about some aspect of moving forward through this case.

Till this point I have not filed any motions with respect to discovery. What I received is what I believe Ms. George received, which is the public testimony and the admitted exhibits in the Tony Hernandez case. And the government provided that to me on the hard drive.

I know that your Honor just completed the trial of Mr. Geovanny Fuentes. I had occasion to listen to some of the proceedings. I was going to ask the government, now that that case is over, to provide me with the public documentation from that case as well to determine whether it has any application to my client's case and whether I could glean any additional information that might be useful in preparing a defense.

Given what's transpired with the government and

counsel for the co-defendant, I thought that I would also, you know, take the opportunity to discuss with the government what else might be available and see if we can have some resolution if there are other additional materials that I need to get.

And I have explained to the government what else I might want in my letter to them as well.

THE COURT: All right. And what has the government done in response to your letter?

MR. FEITEL: We had a phone call and the government basically told me that they did not think that I was entitled to anything more.

There are some things — I'm, as well as Ms. George, aware of the law on the bill of particulars and about the difference between Rule 16 and 3500 material, but there are in this case some issues that I think might call for the granting of a bill of particulars, and without wanting to preargue or to prejudge, my client is charged with a weapons possession offense during a 15-year time frame, and that's also not solely in one country but in three countries. And I do think, with respect to that charge, additional discovery would be warranted to help me prepare a defense. It's complicated to defend against a charge that transpires over 15 years. It's not — there is a conspiracy, but there is also a possession charge for weapons. And it is somewhat complicated for an attorney to prepare a defense given the lengthy period of time that's

alleged in the indictment.

And so your Honor knows, Ms. George and I intend to try to vigorously investigate this case. I did monitor the proceedings in the Geovanny Fuentes case, and I know that defense counsel in that case asked at the last minute for additional time. We do not plan to do that. But we want to know as much as we can before then so we can actually do an investigation and not have to come back to the court at the last instance and ask for more time.

THE COURT: Well, I'm trying to get this case in a position for a trial date. That's what I'm trying to do. And I take it, Mr. Wirshba, that the government recognizes the importance of pointing defense counsel in the direction of what evidence there might be with regard to the weapons or, if the government is unwilling or unable to do so, then this may be the case where a bill of particulars is appropriate. So are you available tomorrow, Mr. Wirshba?

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, I am available whenever would be helpful to the Court. Of course.

THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Feitel, are you available?

MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor. We had scheduled this case originally for tomorrow at 1 p.m.

THE COURT: All right. So if you could get on the phone with the government tomorrow at 1 o'clock and see whether

you can work this out and let me get a letter from you, again within two weeks. My real question is, is this a case that should be put in for a trial date for the third quarter of 2021, or not? That's the first question. Let me hear from the government.

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, the government is prepared to try the case on whatever schedule the Court believes is best and most expedient.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. George, what do you think?

MS. GEORGE: I do not think so, because, depending on what I receive in my request for discovery in our discussions, we need to do some investigations, which will require an investigator traveling to Guatemala and Honduras for certain documents that I believe to be important. And depending on travel issues with both countries, and COVID requirements, etc., I'm not so sure that things are going to happen that fast.

It's also been my experience in conducting investigations in Honduras and in Guatemala that things just do not appear overnight. And that's why I'm very anxious to get going on this and to push this along as fast as possible, because I know it will take some time there.

THE COURT: Well, but that presupposes that you have not gotten the discovery you're entitled to.

MS. GEORGE: Well, it also -- well, for example, if I receive document A but I know that there's a document that may exist in Guatemala that counters document A on behalf of my client, then I need to go and retrieve that particular document. And that's what I would like to do. That's what I'm proposing to do. There are also some other supporting documents that I have already been in the process of trying to get together. So it's just, instead of punching in the dark here, I would like to know what I have and get going with this. I have absolutely no intentions to delay anything. I have familiarity with investigations in both countries. But I just know, your Honor, that it does take time.

THE COURT: All right. Well, what you can do in your letter which you're going to get me in two weeks is lay out your argument as to when this case should be tried, I mean which quarter of the year. It's third quarter or fourth quarter. And if not either of those, please be specific. If you have any blackout dates in those quarters, let me know what they are.

MS. GEORGE: I will, your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Feitel, let me hear from you on
this case being ready for trial.

MR. FEITEL: Thank you, your Honor. In my experience, it's -- I've viewed some, as I mentioned, prior proceedings with your Honor. I don't want to pick a date without having a

L4CASALCps

1 better per

better perception of what I need to investigate. And I don't want to pick a date and then have to come back to the Court at the last minute and say, oh, we're terribly sorry, we're not ready. I think that's not the kind of professionalism that we're looking to demonstrate in this case. So I want to talk to Mr. Wirshba and consult with my client as well. I'm going to be in New York next week. And within the two weeks that your Honor set forth for our letter, I will also articulate when I think this case will be ready for trial and why.

about, in the existing regime, my date for requesting for the third quarter is May 15th, and my date for requesting for the fourth quarter is, I believe, August 15th. So that's the way it works. It's not a trial date at this stage of the game. It's a trial quarter. And then I'll know what dates are available or what date, if any, is available during that quarter. So that's what we're dealing with at the moment.

So I'm going to ask my deputy to get me a date for us to get together in six weeks.

THE CLERK: OK. So in six weeks, would be the week of May 24th.

THE COURT: Approximately. Whatever works best, Flo.

THE CLERK: OK. And because there they're at MCC -- right? Are they at MCC?

MS. GEORGE: Yes, Flo, they're at MCC.

```
L4CASALCps
```

```
1
               THE CLERK: OK. So it has to be a Monday, a
 2
      Wednesday, or a Friday. A Friday.
 3
               Will it be in person or on the phone, Judge?
               THE COURT: I think for the next conference we can do
 4
5
      it by phone.
               THE CLERK:
6
                          OK.
 7
               THE COURT: Is that agreeable to the defendants?
8
     Ms. George?
9
               MS. GEORGE: Yes, your Honor, for me.
10
               THE COURT: And Mr. Feitel?
11
               MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor, on behalf of my client.
12
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
13
                          May 26th at 10:30.
               THE CLERK:
14
               THE COURT: All right. Does that work for the
      government?
15
16
               MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Ms. George?
18
               MS. GEORGE: Yes, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Mr. Feitel?
19
20
               MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: All right. That will be the next time
22
      we'll get together. And I'll hear the government's
23
      application.
24
               MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor. The government would
25
      seek to exclude time until that date, under the Speedy Trial
```

Act, to allow the parties to continue to engage in discussions about a possible pretrial disposition, to allow the defense to continue to review discovery and prepare the case for trial, and in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

THE COURT: Ms. George?

MS. GEORGE: So agreed, your Honor.

And I do have one other request before we leave.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine.

Mr. Feitel?

MR. WIRSHBA: I agree, your Honor.

MR. FEITEL: I agree, your Honor. I spoke to

Mr. Salguero before this court hearing commenced, and he agrees
to the tolling of the statute of limitations between now and
the next return of court date.

THE COURT: This would be the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act.

MR. FEITEL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I find that the ends of justice will be served by granting a continuance until May 26th and that the need for a continuance outweighs the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The reasons for my finding are that the time is needed to enable the government and defense counsel to have discussions regarding any additional discovery, for the parties to report back to the Court, and for the parties to engage in trial

preparation. And accordingly the time between today and May 26th is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.

Ms. George, you had something else you wanted to raise.

MS. GEORGE: Yes, your Honor. I would ask if the Court could provide an order requesting some medical attention for my client, who's had some either a back injury or he's not been able to move correctly. He's been asking, putting through requests for medical attention and it has not been — he's not been attended to. I would ask if the Court, if I send in a letter, perhaps the Court can so order it and I can forward it over to MCC?

THE COURT: Ms. George, what I would like you to do is get in touch with staff counsel in the MCC and discuss it with staff counsel. If you do not get a satisfactory resolution in discussing with staff counsel, you can write me a letter, copied to the government, reporting on your interaction with staff counsel in the warden's office.

MS. GEORGE: Will do so. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Feitel, anything else?

MR. FEITEL: Not at this time, your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wirshba?

MR. WIRSHBA: Nothing further from the government,

```
L4CASALCps
      your Honor.
1
               THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you all very much.
 2
      I appreciate your participation this morning. We're adjourned.
3
                (Adjourned)
 4
 5
6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```